Two Important Texts from Geneva

The Preamble On Which Both Sides Agreed and the Test Compromise Proposed by the Neutrals, Pages 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 17 APRIL 30, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Hard Lesson in the New Mushroom Clouds

The resumption of atmospheric testing by the United States in reply to the Soviet resumption last September should not be the occasion for a burst of hysteria on the part of the peace movement. This is not the end of the world. But it should be the occasion for sober thought and greater dedication. It would be easy, and instinctive, and emotionally satisfying, to put the blame on two men, on the two K's, on the simple-minded assumption that if only they had been stronger, better, more moral, resumption might have been avoided. To say this is not to absolve either; both were afraid to take the risks of leadership in an unconventional direction. The military bureaucracies made the decisions on both sides, using the same mirror-image excuses, on one side the menace of communism, on the other that of capitalism. The peace movement needs to keep free of partisans who fall for these hate-breeding clichés and see the struggle for peace only as another form of struggle between these two "isms." To look at what is happening objectively is a first necessity if we are to dig down deep to the real causes and try to do something about them, and to rouse people to the necessity of a major effort.

Both Testing Only—For Peace!

It is obvious that behind their opposing slogans both sides are moved by the same considerations. Both insist self-righteously that they are only testing to preserve peace. Mr. Kennedy in his address of March 2 expressed the hope that by renewing tests in the atmosphere, "the prospects for peace may actually be strengthened" while Mr. Gromyko a few hours before the go-ahead signal was given by Mr. Kennedy told the Supreme Soviet in Moscow that if the U.S. resumed so would the USSR "for security—and to preserve peace." Perhaps peace would be more secure if the two great powers could only restrain this zeal for its preservation. Each side is sure that it is acting only out of concern for its defense; each assumes the other cannot be trusted; each is sure that its own security is also mankind's; and each assumes the right to do as it pleases whatever the cost to other people. The Soviet Union exploded its 50-megaton monster last Fall despite a UN resolution asking it not to do so. We resume atmospheric testing in defiance of another UN resolution in which the nations of the earth voted 71 to 20 to ask for a new moratorium. These wilful acts reflect the realities of an anarchistic and lawless world in which "sovereign" States arrogate to themselves power of life and death over their own peoples and the world. This nation-state system, not capitalism or communism, is the root cause and the enemy. Given the nature of the system, resumption was bound to occur in response to the same military considerations and to the same deep-seated human feelings that "one's own" come first, and that the only safety lies in piling up more weapons than the other tribe possesses.

We who fight for peace must have the courage to fight without delusion, for these delusions only block us off into an imaginary dream world of our own which blissfully bears little resemblance to the real world in which decisions are made. Our marches and demonstrations must not blind us to our own weakness. The majority still responds to the old conditionings. On April 18, for example, the day the U.S. produced its own expanded draft outline for a treaty on complete and general disarmament, the House of Representatives passed the largest peacetime arms budget in our history without a dissenting voice or vote. Nobody questioned, nobody even discussed, the implications of a 25 percent rise in the arms budget, and of our five year program to build a force of strategic missiles and aircraft stupendous enough to wipe out not only Russia many times over but the planet. No one asked how we could negotiate disarmament while we sought energetically to create a hugely disproportionate force on our own side, or how we could make an enemy believe our peaceful intentions when we built up forces strong enough for a first

(Continued on Page Two)

Some Sunrise

We wonder how many Americans are watching our latest project in South Vietnam. It has a glamorous name, "Operation Sunrise," a name which seems to have been thought up by the same genius who decided some years ago at the AEC that Strontium 90 units would be more healthful if called Sunshine Units.

To deprive guerrillas of support we are beginning to burn down the villages in rural areas and resettle the peasants in new centers "surrounded" as one AP dispatch (Wash. Post April 16) described them "by adobe earthworks, barbed wire watchtowers and a moat lined with bamboo spikes." The peasants in their ignorance seem to regard these as concentration camps; many of the younger men head for the forest and the guerrillas instead.

A controversy seems to have broken out between the U.S. officials helping in this benevolent maneuver, and the Vietnamese government. The former think fewer peasants would run away if attractive leaflets explaining the change were dropped on the villages in advance. The Vietnamese think this would only tip them off to start running. Anyway how do you explain to illiterate peasants that burning down their villages is a small price to pay to save South Vietnam for something called free enterprise?

To understand the reaction of the Vietnamese peasants to "Operation Sunrise," imagine the U.S. invaded by Martians who burned our cities and put us in detention camps on the excuse that they wanted to save us from other invaders from outer space whose ideas—they assured us—we would find obnoxious if only we could understand them. We can just see an eager beaver USIA man telling a weeping Vietnamese peasant woman as she leaves her burning home, "But let me tell you about the fallacies of dialectical materialism."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strike. No one seemed aware of these questions. We have two faces. For a world audience, we present a plan of complete disarmament while at home, for an electorate conditioned to the old thinking ("preparations for war will bring us the preservation of peace" as Mr. Kennedy said in his March 2 speech) we vote the biggest arms budget yet. It is significant that the day after the new plan was put forward at Geneva and Goldwater attacked it, only Humphrey and Morse came to its defense in the Senate. Mr. Kennedy's own majority leader, Mansfield, was silent. It was as if no one in the Senate, except for a few idealists on one side and a few suspicious extremists on the other, took disarmament seriously enough to quarrel about it. And we have heard no roar of disapproval from the country against either the vote in the House or the silence in the Senate. People move about their tasks and pastimes as helplessly unable as any colony of social insects to break out of that web of accepted ways which threatens disaster.

Not Altogether Hopeless

Yet the outlook is not entirely hopeless. It is indicative that both sides, despite resumption of testing, are moving closer to a settlement at Berlin, the nerve center of world tension. Two cautious leaders, heading societies fearful of each other, resume testing out of similar military considerations but yet try patiently to keep away from the abyss threatened by a direct confrontation at Berlin or elsewhere. Caution and conventionality, not the insane and bellicose ambition of a Hitler, mark this picture, warning us to get some progress toward agreement before it changes, as it changed in 1933, after the abortive disarmament conference of 1932.

The two general disarmament plans, however cleverly designed to put the other at a disadvantage, still contain many points of agreement. If seen as the beginning of a long drawn out bargaining process, they are not without hope, given time. But there may not be too much time ahead, if tests go on much longer. Both sides indicate a readiness for new talks on testing, after they have had just one more round, and the peace movement ought to wage an intensified campaign world-wide to make future moratoriums something more than a pause while the laboratories blueprint new monsters. A dangerous new tendency is the increased number of proof-

How to Shape The News

Over the Easter week-end, a good time to release news you want few people to see, the AEC put out an announcement that should be big news at Geneva, but of which the disarmament conferees will remain unaware. The announcement said that on opening the tunnel in which Project Gnome was exploded in New Mexico last Dec. 10, the AEC found that instead of being 5 kilotons, as announced, it turned out to be only 3 "plus or minus one." The only place we saw the story was the Washington Star Saturday afternoon April 21. Neither the press release nor the story, of course, explained its significance. It meant (1) that the shot detected as far away as Japan and Sweden was even smaller than was thought and (2) that Dr. Teller's theory about hiding nuclear explosions in big salt caverns was even more wrong than we reported last week. This shot—somewhere between two and four kilotons—looked like a shot of from 15 to 30.

The headlines were made Monday morning after Easter, an ideal time for a release, by a quite different story, a pessimistic report on test detection by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, based on hearings it held last July. This made the top of page one in the New York Times April 23 in an account by John W. Finney, who faithfully reflects the AEC line; he buried the Project Gnome revelation in his story without explanation. We dare not, so soon after last week's overly technical issue, enter into the details. But this belated report was based on hearings at which AEC, Defense and Rand Corp. held the stage unchallenged. Chairman Holifield, under whom the Committee has become a mouthpiece of the AEC, made no real effort to canvass independent opinion. What he held was not an investigation but an official briefing—by officials who favor resumption of testing.

The Compromise Test Inspection Plan Proposed at Geneva by the Eight Neutrals

"The delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic at the 18-nation disarmament conference, deeply distressed that no agreement has yet been reached concerning a ban on nuclear weapons tests, address an earnest appeal to the nuclear powers to persist in their efforts to come to an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapon testing for all time. . . .

"They believe that possibilities exist in establishing by agreement a system for continuous observation and effective control on a purely scientific and non-political basis. Such a system might be based and built upon already existing national networks of observation posts and institutions, or if more appropriate, on certain of the existing posts designated by agreement for the purpose together, if necessary, with new posts established by agreement.

"The existing networks already include in their scientific endeavours the detection and identification of man-made explosions. Improvements could no doubt be achieved by furnishing posts with more advanced instrumentation.

"Furthermore, the feasibility of constituting by agreement an international commission, consisting of a limited number of highly qualified scientists, possibly from non-aligned countries, together with the appropriate staff might be considered.

"This commission should be entrusted with the tasks of processing all data received from the agreed system of observation posts and of reporting on any nuclear explosion or suspicious event on the basis of thorough and objective examination of all the available data.

"All parties to the treaty should accept the obligation to furnish the commission with the facts necessary to establish the nature of any suspicious and significant event.

"Pursuant to this obligation the parties to the treaty could invite the commission to visit their territories and/or the site of the event the nature of which was in doubt.

"Should the Commission find that it was unable to reach a conclusion on the nature of a significant event it would so inform the party on whose territory that event had occurred, and simultaneously inform it of the points on which urgent clarification seemed necessary.

"The party and the commission should consult as to what further measures of clarification, including verification in loco, would facilitate the assessment. The party concerned would, in accordance with its obligation referred to in paragraph 4 above, give speedy and full co-operation to facilitate the assessment.

"After full examination of the facts, taking into account any additional data furnished to it as suggested above, the international commission would inform the parties to the treaty of all the circumstances of the case and of its assessment of the concerned event.

"The parties to the treaty would be free to determine their action with regard to the treaty on the basis of reports furnished by the international commission."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firings. As weapons accumulate, this so-called proof-testing can spiral into a miniature Russo-American war on mankind, polluting the common skies with radioactive poisons. If enough people can be aroused, something may yet be accomplished. But the struggle will be more effective if we understand compassionately that the enemy is within, that man's fight is against the chains of his own habits and institutions. Man must surpass himself or die.

What the Neutrals Could Do

From London over the week-end Bertrand Russell, who has done so much to rouse mankind, urged the neutrals to send their ships in protest to the international waters where our "barbarous" tests are beginning. It is unlikely that neutrals, beholden to both sides and anxious for financial aid from both, would take the risk. A more fundamental contribution could be made by them if they set the great Powers an example, if Nehru expressed a readiness peacefully to compromise the Kashmir dispute; Nasser, the Arab quarrel with Israel; Tito, his old feud with Albania. These three neutrals by offering to accept world mediation, and arbitration in their own fiercely felt quarrels, could say by their action, "The world can no longer afford war, national wills must be curbed for the planetary good, we will sacrifice our own deeply held interests in the cause of world settlement and world law. We will inaugurate a new movement, to join the human race into one people with one government." But just as Kennedy—or most Americans—will not give up a new round of tests after Khrushchev's nor Khrushchev—or most Russians—a new round after Kennedy's, so the smaller powers too are unwilling to sacrifice for peace. We Americans and the Russians are bad enough but not without restraint. Everywhere, in Indonesia's quarrel with Holland, in the shooting on the Israeli-Syrian border, in the Algerian agony, men reach quickly for the gun. How really rouse people to the statistics of fall-out damage to future generations when they are so ready to kill in this one? So long as murder regulates human affairs, in petty quarrels as in great, the planet is not safe, nor the future of our species secure. This is the hard lesson in the new mushroom clouds.

What U. S. Newspaper Would Dare Speak So Objectively of China?

"For all the errors, China's present plight should not be exaggerated. There is always this danger in assessing a country which is as unwilling to allow outside verification of its economic progress as the Russians are to allow verification of nuclear tests. Sympathizers see tremendous dedication and presume immense progress; opponents hear of shortages and difficulties and presume suffering and collapse. The truth is that the sufferings of the ordinary Chinese peasant from war, disorder, and famine have been immeasurably less in the last decade than in any other decade in the century. And when the People's Daily claimed yesterday that the first foundations had been laid for building a modern economy in China it was quite right. But the modern economy will be a long time coming."

—Editorial in The Times (London) April 18.

Exclusive: Text of the Preamble to A General Disarmament Pact Adopted at Geneva

"The States of the World: 1. Acting in accordance with the aspirations and will of all the peoples:

"2. Reaffirming their dedication to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter:

"3. Desiring to create conditions in which all peoples can strive freely and peacefully to achieve their just aspirations:

"4. Conscious of the threat to mankind posed by the arms race, especially in view of the development of nuclear, rocket and other modern weapons of mass destruction:

"5. Convinced that war can no longer serve as a method of settling international disputes and must forever be banished from the life of human society:

"6. Determined that this and succeeding generations should be free from the scourge of war and the dangers of the arms race:

"7. Convinced that disarmament must be general and complete under strict and effective international control and that such disarmament must be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter:

"8. Convinced that general and complete disarmament under strict international control is a sure and practical way to fulfill mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth:

"9. Desiring to end forever the heavy burden placed on mankind by the diversion of human and material resources to creation of the means of annihilating human beings and of destroying material and cultural values:

"10. Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring further economic and social progress in all countries in the world and ensuring that the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advancement:

"11. Convinced that the resources released by general and complete disarmament will enhance the capacity of states so disarmed to contribute to the economic and cultural development of all countries and peoples of the world and contribute to greater cooperation among them:

"12. Conscious of the need to build relations among states on the basis of the principles of peace, good neighborliness, equality, non-interference and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all states:

"13. Desiring to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and international law can be maintained:

"14. Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament [in a peaceful world] it is important that all states abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means:

"15. [Declaring their goal to be a free, secure and, peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of international conduct, a world where change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter]:

"16. Have resolved to conclude the following treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control [in a peaceful world]."

—Text of the draft preamble to a general disarmament treaty as proposed by the USSR and the USA and adopted by the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva April 17. This was not carried by AP or UPI but was picked up by us off the Reuters ticker, marked for the attention of the Canadian press which apparently was more interested than the U.S. press. So far as we know no U.S. paper carried this text, a noble affirmation of humanity's wistful hopes, which we thought our readers would like to see. The words in brackets were not accepted by the USSR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not All Those Distortions Abroad Were Created by Radio Moscow

A Challenge: How Attorney General Kennedy Could Improve Our "Image"

Attorney General Kennedy, in an address to the Associated Press, that fine old non-conformist organization, expressed alarm over our image—as we idolators phrase it—abroad. He wants more Americans to go on tour and stand up and answer questions. He assumes the questions can be answered easily.

The answers are easy when the questions are based on ignorance. The answers are difficult when they contain a substantial half truth. An example is the area of political expression. The Communists do not allow anti-Communists to speak. But are we exactly hospitable to suspected pro-Communists? How does a speaker abroad explain the Smith Act? The House Un-American Activities Committee? The unofficial blacklist in the entertainment industries—now being challenged in John Henry Faulk's suit against AWARE? The refusal of visas to foreign visitors like Konni Zilliacus whose views we dislike or Tshombe whose speeches we fear? The McCarran Act with its Subversive Activities Control Board?

Under The Free World Makeup

The sharp-eyed intellectuals of the Soviet bloc, eager for freedom, and those of the colonial world, quick to spot the hypocrisy of either side, see in these the familiar visage of police state practice under the thin makeup of free world rhetoric.

It takes the drama of courage to build a tradition. It takes more than Madison Avenue hot air to keep it alive. If the Attorney General had the nerve, he could make a dramatic change in our image abroad by recommending, for instance, the repeal of the McCarran Act. He could quote Truman's veto message and the warnings of the many distinguished conservative lawyers who opposed its passage. He could say its central idea—that the State had a right to protect the people against "dangerous thoughts"—was incompatible with American philosophy. He could say that unlike our great antagonists we would were not afraid to let the opposition—not the Republicans but the real opposition, the revolutionary Marxists of any variety—speak undisturbed.

Subversion Everywhere

It was a shock from which recovery will not be easy to pick up the paper and see that the Republican leadership of the House and Senate had issued a formal statement about the FBI in the steel price affair which sounded like the American Civil Liberties Union in its more militant moments. It spoke of "the feared knock on the door" and "the shadow of police state methods" and it expressed the "hope that we never again step into those dark regions whatever the controversy of the moment, be it economic or political." The references, of course, were to the FBI's action in routing several newspapermen out of bed at 3 a.m. to check on statements attributed to a steel company official. We welcome the libertarian sentiments and also object to the knock-on-the-door in the small hours, especially to newspapermen, even when done by telephone. But what really disturbs us is an even darker picture, on which the Republican leaders hardly dared to touch. This was the zeal displayed by the G-men when let loose on the steel trust. To see the FBI rushing off on the trail of the steel magnates, like the NKVD on the hunt for kulaks, is enough to make stronger men than Dirksen and Halleck quail. Thanks to the John Birch Society, we had grown accustomed to living with the idea that maybe Dwight Eisenhower has been a secret Marxist-Leninist all along, like Fidel Castro. But J. Edgar Hoover! We had supposed that he would turn in his badge rather than let his men be used in a crypto-collectivist assault on U.S. Steel. Now, for the first time, we know how the DAR feels.

We can assure the Attorney General such a campaign would win cheers for America from the best youth everywhere. It would also show him, in the cold reaction from certain quarters here, that if we are to explain Americanism, there is even more need at home than abroad to stand up—as he said—and answer questions. Not everybody who vociferously calls himself American would be recognized by Jefferson as kissin' kin.

And may we add—since he spoke so much of Hungary and Tibet—that it's not exactly easy to explain Cuba, either?

The Two Geneva Issues Still Available Free If You Send Long Stamped Addressed Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/30/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED